REMARKS

The Office Action dated August 31, 2007 has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-12, 14, 15, 18, 19, 21-26, 29, 30, 32-37, 39-41, 44, 45, 47-51, 54, 55, and 57-60 are now pending in this application. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-12, 14, 15, 17-19, 21-26, 28-30, 32-37, 39-41, 43-45, 47-51, 53-55, and 57-60 stand rejected. Claims 3, 17, 28, 43, and 53 have been canceled.

The rejection of Claims 1, 3-5, 7-12, 14, 15, 17-19, 21-26, 28-30, 32-37, 39-41, 43-45, 47-51, 53-55, and 57-60 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over International Publication No. WO 01/13261 to Juedes, et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Juedes") in view of U.S. Patent 6,963,847 to Kennedy, et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Kennedy"), U.S. Patent 6,876,977 to Marks (hereinafter referred to as "Marks"), and U.S. Patent 5,963,915 to Kirsch (hereinafter referred to as "Kirsch") is respectfully traversed.

Juedes describes a system (100) for fulfilling orders placed by a customer (104) from the provider (106) of a product over the Internet (102). Once the customer has placed an order, the provider sends the order information to an e-commerce hub (112) which arranges for the product's transportation and delivery. The e-commerce hub software automatically selects, based on the order information and predetermined stored criteria, which of a plurality of predetermined carriers should be used to transport the product from the provider to the customer. A request for shipping the product is then sent from the e-commerce hub to the selected carrier. If the request for shipping is accepted by the carrier, a notification of shipment is sent from the e-commerce hub to either the provider or the customer, or both. Juedes also describes an order timeline feasibility study module of the e-commerce hub that determines whether the transportation of the product and/or the delivery of the product to the customer from the provider is possible within the time period defined by the pickup date and the delivery date. If the transportation and delivery are found to be infeasible, the order for shipment is rejected by the e-commerce hub. Juedes does not describe or suggest, however, determining an ability of a delivery agent to ship an order based on a first potential arrival

date and a number of slots to be shipped, the number of slots calculated from a work unit matrix.

Kennedy describes a system (10) for fulfilling commitments in a distributed supply chain planning environment. The system (10) includes a fulfillment server (16) that manages available-to-promise (ATP) data. The fulfillment server (16) receives an ATP request (30) from one of multiple clients (12). The ATP request (30) includes multiple request line-items that each correspond to a desired product. The fulfillment server (16) generates one or more component ATP requests (32) based on the request line-items and communicates the component ATP requests (32) to one or more local fulfillment managers (14). In response, the fulfillment server (16) receives component quotations (34) from the local fulfillment managers (14). Each component quotation (34) corresponds to an individual component ATP request (32), and includes product availability information for the corresponding desired product. The fulfillment server (16) generates a quotation (36) that includes product availability information for all desired products according to the component quotations (34), and communicates the quotation (36) to the client (12).

Marks describes a computer-implemented method for conducting business-to-business electronic commerce over the Internet, including providing a website that enables electronic communication with users using an electronic shopping basket and enabling two or more remote users to simultaneously access the shopping basket. Each user is permitted to simultaneously view the status of the shopping basket and sequentially affect the state of the shopping basket. The users' ability to affect the state of the basket includes providing the users with selected levels of access to the basket. Any change of state of the basket is automatically sent to all users by a display of the shopping basket on the website.

Kirsch describes an Internet computer system (10) including a conventional computer system (12) that runs a client browser and is connected to the Internet (14) through an Internet Service Provider (ISP). A server computer system (16), also connected to the Internet through an ISP and controlled by a local console (18), executes a Web Server application. The client and server computers are configured to allow a consumer to purchase items via a secure web page presented by the server. The consumer's client browser is

provided with a cookie containing security information that is checked against the server record of the client. Additional levels of authentication and security may be added on the server and include usage of an optional PIN, restrictions on shipping destinations, and email confirmation of orders. These levels are also limited to a server process specific to the acceptance phase of the purchase process.

Claim 1 recites a method of managing a delivery schedule of an order using a system configured with a server which includes a goods delivery system. The system includes at least one computing unit networked to the server, and the order is delivered from at least one supplier to a respective delivery agent, and from the respective delivery agent to a respective buyer, wherein the order includes order information. The method includes the steps of "(1) calculating a first potential arrival date of the order to a respective delivery agent's location using the server system based on an order request date, a respective buyer's address, and a fixed delay; (2) determining an ability of the respective delivery agent to ship the order based on the first potential arrival date and a number of slots to be shipped, the number of slots calculated from a work unit matrix; (3) determining a delivery date to the respective buyer when there is sufficient delivery agent capacity to ship the order to the respective buyer's address; (4) updating an electronic manifest indicating the delivery date of the order and a change in delivery agent capacity for the delivery date; and (5) allowing an order change that affects the delivery date of the order to be made by a user that is authorized by one of the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, the at least one supplier, a store, or a logistics intermediary, wherein allowance of the order change is based on: (a) a type of order change, (b) whether the user is acting as the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, the at least one supplier, the store, or the logistics intermediary, (c) a level of the user, and (d) a security code, wherein, upon allowance of the order change, steps (1), (2), (3) and (4) are repeated to determine a new delivery date."

None of Juedes, Kennedy, Marks, and Kirsch, considered alone or in combination, describes or suggests a method of managing a delivery schedule, as recited in Claim 1. More specifically, none of Juedes, Kennedy, Marks, and Kirsch, considered alone or in combination, describes or suggests determining an ability of a respective delivery agent to

ship an order based on a first potential arrival date and a number of slots to be shipped, wherein the number of slots is calculated from a work unit matrix. Rather, Juedes describes an order timeline feasibility study module of the e-commerce hub that determines whether the transportation of the product and/or the delivery of the product to the customer from the provider is possible within the time period defined by the pickup date and the delivery date. However, the order timeline feasibility study module described by Juedes does not describe or suggest determining whether a respective delivery agent will be able to ship an order based on at least a number of slots to be shipped, the number of slots calculated from a work unit matrix. Moreover, Kennedy, Marks, and/or Kirsch do not overcome the deficiencies of Juedes. Kennedy merely describes a system for fulfilling commitments in a distributed supply chain planning environment, wherein a fulfillment server generates a quotation that includes product availability information for a desired product according to one or more component quotations, and communicates the quotation to a client, Marks merely describes providing users with various levels of access to a shopping basket, and Kirsch merely describes using an option PIN or browser cookie to verify the client user's identity in later transactions.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Juedes in view of Kennedy, Marks, and Kirsch.

Claim 3 has been canceled. Claims 4, 5, 7-12, and 14 depend from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 4, 5, 7-12, and 14 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 4, 5, 7-12, and 14 likewise are patentable over Juedes in view of Kennedy, Marks, and Kirsch.

Claim 15 recites a method of managing a delivery schedule of an order using a system configured with a server which includes a goods delivery system. The system includes at least one computing unit networked to the server, and the order is delivered from at least one supplier to a respective delivery agent, and from the respective delivery agent to a respective buyer, wherein the order comprises order information. The method includes the steps of "(1) calculating a first potential arrival date of the order to a respective delivery agent's location using the server system based on an order request date, a respective buyer's address, and a

fixed delay; (2) determining an ability of the respective delivery agent to ship the order within a set of potential delivery dates based on the first potential arrival date, a first date the respective delivery agent is prepared to ship the order, and a number of slots to be shipped, the number of slots calculated from a work unit matrix; (3) selecting an actual delivery date from the set of potential delivery dates; (4) updating an electronic manifest indicating the actual delivery date of the order and a change in delivery agent capacity for the delivery date; and (5) allowing an order change that affects the actual delivery date of the order to be made by a user that is authorized by one of the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, the at least one supplier, a store, or a logistics intermediary, wherein allowance of the order change is based on: (a) a type of order change, (b) whether the user is acting as the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, the at least one supplier, the store, or the logistics intermediary, (c) a level of the user, and (d) a security code, wherein, upon allowance of the order change, steps (1), (2), (3) and (4) are repeated to determine a new actual delivery date."

None of Juedes, Kennedy, Marks, and Kirsch, considered alone or in combination, describes or suggests a method of managing a delivery schedule, as recited in Claim 15. More specifically, none of Juedes, Kennedy, Marks, and Kirsch, considered alone or in combination, describes or suggests determining an ability of a respective delivery agent to ship an order within a set of potential delivery dates based on a first potential arrival date, a first date the respective delivery agent is prepared to ship the order, and a number of slots to be shipped, wherein the number of slots is calculated from a work unit matrix. Rather, Juedes describes an order timeline feasibility study module of the e-commerce hub that determines whether the transportation of the product and/or the delivery of the product to the customer from the provider is possible within the time period defined by the pickup date and the delivery date. However, the order timeline feasibility study module described by Juedes does not describe or suggest determining whether a respective delivery agent will be able to ship an order based on at least a number of slots to be shipped, the number of slots calculated from a work unit matrix. Moreover, Kennedy, Marks, and/or Kirsch do not overcome the deficiencies of Juedes. Kennedy merely describes a system for fulfilling commitments in a distributed supply chain planning environment, wherein a fulfillment server generates a quotation that includes product availability information for a desired product according to one

or more component quotations, and communicates the quotation to a client, Marks merely describes providing users with various levels of access to a shopping basket, and Kirsch merely describes using an option PIN or browser cookie to verify the client user's identity in later transactions.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 15 is submitted to be patentable over Juedes in view of Kennedy, Marks, and Kirsch.

Claim 17 has been canceled. Claims 18, 19, and 21-25 depend from independent Claim 15. When the recitations of Claims 18, 19, and 21-25 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 15, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 18, 19, and 21-25 likewise are patentable over Juedes in view of Kennedy, Marks, and Kirsch.

Claim 26 recites a computer program storage medium readable by a computer system and encoding a computer program of instructions for executing a computer process for managing deliveries of a goods delivery system. The system is employed to deliver an order from at least one supplier to a respective delivery agent, and from the respective delivery agent to a respective buyer, given order information. The computer process includes the steps of "(1) determining a first potential arrival date of the order to a respective delivery agent's location, based on an order request date, a respective buyer's address, and a fixed delay; (2) determining an ability of the respective delivery agent to ship the order based on the first potential arrival date and a number of slots to be shipped, the number of slots calculated from a work unit matrix; (3) determining a delivery date to the respective buyer when there is sufficient delivery agent capacity to ship the order to the respective buyer's address; (4) updating an electronic manifest indicating the delivery date of the order and a change in delivery agent capacity for the delivery date; and (5) allowing an order change that affects the delivery date of the order to be made by a user that is authorized by one of the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, the at least one supplier, a store, or a logistics intermediary, wherein allowance of the order change is based on: (a) a type of order change, (b) whether the user is acting as the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, the at least one supplier, the store, or the logistics intermediary, (c) a level of the user, and (d) a

security code, wherein, upon allowance of the order change, steps (1), (2), (3) and (4) are repeated to determine a new delivery date."

None of Juedes, Kennedy, Marks, and Kirsch, considered alone or in combination, describes or suggests a computer program storage medium, as recited in Claim 26. More specifically, none of Juedes, Kennedy, Marks, and Kirsch, considered alone or in combination, describes or suggests determining an ability of a respective delivery agent to ship an order based on a first potential arrival date and a number of slots to be shipped, wherein the number of slots is calculated from a work unit matrix. Rather, Juedes describes an order timeline feasibility study module of the e-commerce hub that determines whether the transportation of the product and/or the delivery of the product to the customer from the provider is possible within the time period defined by the pickup date and the delivery date. However, the order timeline feasibility study module described by Juedes does not describe or suggest determining whether a respective delivery agent will be able to ship an order based on at least a number of slots to be shipped, the number of slots calculated from a work unit matrix. Moreover, Kennedy, Marks, and/or Kirsch do not overcome the deficiencies of Juedes. Kennedy merely describes a system for fulfilling commitments in a distributed supply chain planning environment, wherein a fulfillment server generates a quotation that includes product availability information for a desired product according to one or more component quotations, and communicates the quotation to a client, Marks merely describes providing users with various levels of access to a shopping basket, and Kirsch merely describes using an option PIN or browser cookie to verify the client user's identity in later transactions.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 26 is submitted to be patentable over Juedes in view of Kennedy, Marks, and Kirsch.

Claim 28 has been canceled. Claims 29, 30, 32-37, and 39 depend from independent Claim 26. When the recitations of Claims 29, 30, 32-37, and 39 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 26, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 29, 30, 32-37, and 39 likewise are patentable over Juedes in view of Kennedy, Marks, and Kirsch.

Claim 40 recites an apparatus for managing the delivery of an order from at least one supplier to a respective delivery agent, and from the respective delivery agent to a respective buyer, given order information. The apparatus includes "means for determining a first potential arrival date of the order to a respective delivery agent's location, based on an order request date, a respective buyer's address, and a fixed delay; means for determining an ability of the respective delivery agent to ship the order based on the first potential arrival date and a number of slots to be shipped, the number of slots calculated from a work unit matrix; means for determining a delivery date to the respective buyer when there is sufficient delivery agent capacity to ship the order to the respective buyer's address; means for updating an electronic manifest indicating an order ship date and a change in delivery agent capacity for the delivery date; and means for allowing an order change that affects the delivery date of the order to be made by a user that is authorized by one of the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, the at least one supplier, a store, or a logistics intermediary, wherein allowance of the order change is based on: (a) a type of order change, (b) whether the user is acting as the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, the at least one supplier, the store, or the logistics intermediary, (c) a level of the user, and (d) a security code, wherein, upon allowance of the order change, said apparatus determines a new delivery date and updates the electronic manifest."

None of Juedes, Kennedy, Marks, and Kirsch, considered alone or in combination, describes or suggests an apparatus for managing a delivery, as recited in Claim 40. More specifically, none of Juedes, Kennedy, Marks, and Kirsch, considered alone or in combination, describes or suggests a means for determining an ability of a respective delivery agent to ship an order based on a first potential arrival date and a number of slots to be shipped, wherein the number of slots is calculated from a work unit matrix. Rather, Juedes describes an order timeline feasibility study module of the e-commerce hub that determines whether the transportation of the product and/or the delivery of the product to the customer from the provider is possible within the time period defined by the pickup date and the delivery date. However, the order timeline feasibility study module described by Juedes does not describe or suggest determining whether a respective delivery agent will be able to ship an order based on at least a number of slots to be shipped, the number of slots calculated from

a work unit matrix. Moreover, Kennedy, Marks, and/or Kirsch do not overcome the deficiencies of Juedes. Kennedy merely describes a system for fulfilling commitments in a distributed supply chain planning environment, wherein a fulfillment server generates a quotation that includes product availability information for a desired product according to one or more component quotations, and communicates the quotation to a client, Marks merely describes providing users with various levels of access to a shopping basket, and Kirsch merely describes using an option PIN or browser cookie to verify the client user's identity in later transactions.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 40 is submitted to be patentable over Juedes in view of Kennedy, Marks, and Kirsch.

Claim 41 recites a method of managing a delivery schedule of a multiple brand order using a system configured with a server which includes a goods delivery system. The system includes at least one computing unit networked to the server, the multiple brand order being delivered from at least two suppliers to a respective delivery agent, and from the respective delivery agent to a respective buyer, wherein the multiple brand order comprises order information. The method includes the steps of "(1) calculating a first potential arrival date of the multiple brand order to a respective delivery agent's location using the server system based on an order request date, a respective buyer's address, and a fixed delay; (2) determining an ability of the respective delivery agent to ship the multiple brand order from the at least two suppliers based on the first potential arrival date and a number of slots to be shipped, the number of slots calculated from a work unit matrix; (3) determining a delivery date to the respective buyer when there is sufficient delivery agent capacity to ship the multiple brand order to the respective buyer's address; (4) updating an electronic manifest indicating the delivery date of the multiple brand order and a change in delivery agent capacity for the delivery date; and (5) allowing an order change that affects the delivery date of the multiple brand order to be made by a user that is authorized by one of the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, the at least two suppliers, a store, or a logistics intermediary, wherein allowance of the order change is based on: (a) a type of order change, (b) whether the user is acting as the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, one of the

at least two suppliers, the store, or the logistics intermediary, (c) a level of the user, and (d) a security code, wherein, upon allowance of the order change, steps (1), (2), (3) and (4) are repeated to determine a new delivery date."

None of Juedes, Kennedy, Marks, and Kirsch, considered alone or in combination, describes or suggests a method of managing a delivery schedule of a multiple brand order, as recited in Claim 41. More specifically, none of Juedes, Kennedy, Marks, and Kirsch, considered alone or in combination, describes or suggests determining an ability of a respective delivery agent to ship a multiple brand order from at least two suppliers based on a first potential arrival date and a number of slots to be shipped, wherein the number of slots is calculated from a work unit matrix. Rather, Juedes describes an order timeline feasibility study module of the e-commerce hub that determines whether the transportation of the product and/or the delivery of the product to the customer from the provider is possible within the time period defined by the pickup date and the delivery date. However, the order timeline feasibility study module described by Juedes does not describe or suggest determining whether a respective delivery agent will be able to ship an order based on at least a number of slots to be shipped, the number of slots calculated from a work unit matrix. Moreover, Kennedy, Marks, and/or Kirsch do not overcome the deficiencies of Juedes. Kennedy merely describes a system for fulfilling commitments in a distributed supply chain planning environment, wherein a fulfillment server generates a quotation that includes product availability information for a desired product according to one or more component quotations, and communicates the quotation to a client, Marks merely describes providing users with various levels of access to a shopping basket, and Kirsch merely describes using an option PIN or browser cookie to verify the client user's identity in later transactions.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 41 is submitted to be patentable over Juedes in view of Kennedy, Marks, and Kirsch.

Claim 43 has been canceled. Claims 44, 45, and 47-50 depend from independent Claim 41. When the recitations of Claims 44, 45, and 47-50 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 41, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 44, 45, and 47-50 likewise are patentable over Juedes in view of Kennedy, Marks, and Kirsch.

Claim 51 recites a method of managing a delivery schedule of a multiple brand order using a system configured with a server which includes a goods delivery system. The system includes at least one computing unit networked to the server, and the order is delivered from at least two suppliers to a respective delivery agent, and from the respective delivery agent to a respective buyer, wherein the multiple brand order comprises order information. The method includes the steps of "(1) calculating a first potential arrival date of the multiple brand order to a respective delivery agent's location using the server system based on an order request date, a respective buyer's address, and a fixed delay; (2) determining an ability of the respective delivery agent to ship the multiple brand order from the at least two suppliers based on the first potential arrival date and a number of slots to be shipped, the number of slots calculated from a work unit matrix; (3) determining a delivery date to the respective buyer when there is sufficient delivery agent capacity to ship the multiple brand order to the respective buyer's address; (4) updating an electronic manifest indicating the delivery date of the multiple brand order and a change in delivery agent capacity for the delivery date; and (5) allowing an order change that affects the delivery date of the multiple brand order to be made by a user that is authorized by one of the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, the at least two suppliers, a store, or a logistics intermediary, wherein allowance of the order change is based on: (a) a type of order change, (b) whether the user is acting as the respective delivery agent, the respective buyer, one of the at least two suppliers, the store, or the logistics intermediary, (c) a level of the user, and (d) a security code, wherein, upon allowance of the order change, steps (1), (2), (3) and (4) are repeated to determine a new delivery date."

None of Juedes, Kennedy, Marks, and Kirsch, considered alone or in combination, describes or suggests a method of managing a delivery schedule of a multiple brand order, as recited in Claim 51. More specifically, none of Juedes, Kennedy, Marks, and Kirsch, considered alone or in combination, describes or suggests determining an ability of a respective delivery agent to ship a multiple brand order from at least two suppliers based on a first potential arrival date and a number of slots to be shipped, wherein the number of slots is calculated from a work unit matrix. Rather, Juedes describes an order timeline feasibility study module of the e-commerce hub that determines whether the transportation of the

product and/or the delivery of the product to the customer from the provider is possible within the time period defined by the pickup date and the delivery date. However, the order timeline feasibility study module described by Juedes does not describe or suggest determining whether a respective delivery agent will be able to ship an order based on at least a number of slots to be shipped, the number of slots calculated from a work unit matrix. Moreover, Kennedy, Marks, and/or Kirsch do not overcome the deficiencies of Juedes. Kennedy merely describes a system for fulfilling commitments in a distributed supply chain planning environment, wherein a fulfillment server generates a quotation that includes product availability information for a desired product according to one or more component quotations, and communicates the quotation to a client, Marks merely describes providing users with various levels of access to a shopping basket, and Kirsch merely describes using an option PIN or browser cookie to verify the client user's identity in later transactions.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 51 is submitted to be patentable over Juedes in view of Kennedy, Marks, and Kirsch.

Claim 53 has been canceled. Claims 54, 55, and 57-60 depend from independent Claim 51. When the recitations of Claims 54, 55, and 57-60 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 51, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 54, 55, and 57-60 likewise are patentable over Juedes in view of Kennedy, Marks, and Kirsch.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-12, 14, 15, 18, 19, 21-26, 29, 30, 32-37, 39-41, 44, 45, 47-51, 54, 55, and 57-60 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Eric T. Krischke
Registration No. 42,769
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070